

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1-0 were presented in the originally filed application. Claims 1, 6 and 7 are amended. Claims 5 and 9 are cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10 are pending. No new matter was added.

§103 Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10 are rejected as obvious over Gordon (US6677929) in view of Shinz (JP409237157). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

On page 12 of the current Office Action, the Examiner has clearly stated that claims 5 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response to the current Office Action, Applicant has followed the Examiner's advice and amended claim 1 by incorporating the limitations of allowable claim 5 and amended claim 7 by incorporating the limitations allowable claim 9.

Hence, Applicant has amended claim 1 for clarification and not to overcome the purported prior art. As amended, claim 1 now discloses:

A method of inputting a character in a portable device having a display screen, comprising:

a step of maintaining a database in which at least one character image and character data are recorded corresponding to each other;

a step of locating a pointer at a predetermined pointer start area on the display screen;

a step of sensing the movement of an object which moves being in contact with an optical interface unit of the portable device;

a step of inputting a character by moving the pointer from the pointer start area according to the sensed movement; and

a step of returning the pointer to the pointer start area according to the input of the character,

wherein the step of inputting a character by moving the pointer from the pointer start area according to the sensed movement comprises:

a step of generating the character image corresponding to the sensed movement;

a step of identifying and extracting character data corresponding to the generated character image from the database;
and

a step of displaying the extracted character data on the display screen.

Additionally, Applicant has amended claim 7 for clarification and not to overcome the purported prior art. As amended, claim 7 now discloses:

A portable device capable of inputting characters, comprising:

a database maintaining at least one character image and character data corresponding to the character image;

a display unit for displaying a predetermined character or a pointer on a predetermined display screen;

an optical interface unit contacting with a predetermined object, emitting an optical signal to the object, and receiving an optical reflection signal reflected from the object;

an optical signal sensing unit sensing the movement of the object by interpreting the received optical reflection signal and; and

a pointer control unit locating the pointer at a pointer start area on the display screen, inputting a character

by moving the pointer from the pointer start area according to the sensed movement, and returning the pointer to the pointer start area according to the input of the character

a character image generating unit generating a pointer character image corresponding to the sensed movement; and
a character identifying/extracting unit identifying the character image corresponding to the pointer character image from the database and extracting the character data corresponding to the identified character image.

Neither Gordon nor Shinz disclose or suggest "a step of maintaining a database in which at least one character image and character data are recorded corresponding to each other; wherein the step of inputting a character by moving the pointer from the pointer start area according to the sensed movement comprises, a step of generating the character image corresponding to the sensed movement; a step of identifying and extracting character data corresponding to the generated character image from the database; and a step of displaying the extracted character data on the display screen."

Looking to page 12 of the current Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that the prior art of record particularly fails to teach or fairly suggest the step of inputting a character by moving the pointer according to the sensed movement.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 7 are allowable as reasoned above.
Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C.
§103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 7.

Regarding claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 10, dependent claims are nonobvious under section 103 if the independent claims from which they depend are nonobvious. *Hartness Int'l, Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng'g Co.*, 819 F.2d 1100, 1108, 2 USPQ2d 1826, 1831 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *In re Abele*, 684 F.2d 902, 910, 214 USPQ 682, 689 (CCPA 1982); see also *In re Sernaker*, 702 F.2d 989, 991, 217 USPQ 1, 3 (Fed. Cir. 1983). See also *Kovin Assoc. v. Extech/Exterior Technologies*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 63250 (N.D. Ill. 2006), citing *Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Thus, claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 10 are not unpatentable over Gordon in view of Shinz and should be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Blake E. Vande Garde
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 58,264

Customer No. 29494
Hammer & Associates, P.C.
3125 Springbank Lane
Suite G
Charlotte, NC 28226
Telephone: 704-927-0400
Facsimile: 704-927-0485
H:\2108\003\AmendmentAF022410.doc